

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| MARCUS D. POLK, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | NO. 3:20-cv-00069 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | JUDGE RICHARDSON |
| |) | |
| TONY PARKER, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

ORDER

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 124), recommending that Defendant Tony Parker's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 99) and Defendants CoreCivic, Madalyn Huff, Yolanda Pittman, Russell Washburn, and Rubenard Risper's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 109) be granted. The Magistrate Judge further recommends that Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment claims against all defendants be dismissed. No Objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed.

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at *2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at * 1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and the file. The Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant Parker's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 99) and Defendants CoreCivic, Huff, Pittman, Washburn, and Risper's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 109) are GRANTED. Accordingly, no further claims remain pending (Against any Defendant), and the Clerk is directed to close the file. This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case for purposes of Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE